

1 **WO**

2 NOT FOR PUBLICATION

3

4

5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8

9 Michael Edward Haskins and Barbara)
Haskins,

No. CV-10-1000-PHX-GMS

10

Plaintiffs,

ORDER

11

vs.

12

Brian T. Moynihan, et al.,

13

Defendants.

14

15

Pending before the Court are Defendants’ Second Motion to Quash Service of
16 Summons (Doc. 60), Plaintiffs’ Response and Reply thereto (Docs. 66-67). After
17 consideration,

18

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion to Quash Service of Summons is
19 Granted.

20

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED directing the Clerk of the Court to strike the Summons
21 Returned Executed (Docs. 62-65).

22


IT IS FURTHER ORDERED directing the Plaintiffs to properly serve the Summons
23 and Second Amended Complaint upon Defendants pursuant to Rule 4 of the Federal Rules
24 of Civil Procedure and notice of proof of service must be filed with the Court within the time
25 stated. It is the responsibility of Plaintiffs to familiarize themselves with the rules. The rules
26 can be found on the Court’s website at www.azd.uscourts.gov.

27

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Plaintiffs fail to prosecute this action or comply
28 with the rules or any Court Order, the Court may dismiss the action with prejudice pursuant

1 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th
2 Cir.1992) (holding that the district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing a pro se
3 plaintiff's complaint for failing to comply with a court order).

4 DATED this 12th day of October, 2010.

5
6 
7 _____
8 G. Murray Snow
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28